A U M

Neither father nor mother nor kindred can confer greater benefits than does the well-directed mind. —*The Dhammapada*

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XLI **October, 1953** **No. 12**

PROBLEMS OF SELF-CONSCIOUSNESS

> Now the evolution of the *external* form or body round the *astral* is produced by the terrestrial forces, just as in the case of the lower kingdoms; but the evolution of the internal or real MAN is purely spiritual. It is now no more a passage of the impersonal Monad through many and various forms of matter—endowed at best with instinct and consciousness on quite a different plane—as in the case of external evolution, but a journey of the "pilgrim-soul" through various *states* of *not only matter* but Self-consciousness and self-perception, or of *perception* from apperception. (*The Secret Doctrine* I, 175.)

THE operation of the law of interdependence throughout Great Nature is everywhere evident, even though the participants in this universal scheme of mutual aid can hardly be said to exercise an "ethical" sense in their various relationships. It is just as possible to regard the interdependence of nature as a mutual "devouring" as to think of it as "cooperation," although, from the far-reaching viewpoint of the evolution of intelligence, this may be no real contradiction.

In nature, the weak succumb to the strong, yet are often also supported by them, as in the case of certain strange partnerships among animal species. Nor is any area of the earth's surface "wasted," left barren of creatures in pursuit of life and survival. If a tree cannot grow on a mountain peak, the lichen can and does. The luxurious damp of the jungle would soon destroy a desert plant, while animals used to the rigors of a wild existence sadden and die in captivity. The balance of nature, meanwhile, is maintained in countless subtle ways. A species profligate in reproduction dies by the thousand, thus gaining a stable

population. The rare bird is often almost invulnerable, strong in offense and defense. Meddling scientists have found to their embarrassment that the equilibrium of supply and demand in nature is often disturbed by man only at the cost of multiplying disaster, and this discovery, in some cases, has led to a kind of earth-mysticism in honor of the wisdom of the natural world.

Yet how much more complicated and difficult to understand is the balance of nature in the field of consciousness—the region of human evolution! Here, all the struggle of the other kingdoms is mirrored in one aspect of human existence, while, at the same time, it is denied and contended against in theory and in fact. Here, too, the weaker succumb to the stronger, yet are protected by the stronger, but with the extraordinary addition, in both cases, of the dimension of mind. What is "interdependence" for man? There are those who eagerly exploit the ethical idea of the brotherhood of life, insisting that they must be "taken care of." Others point to the struggle for survival in the lower kingdoms, making this observation the basis of their claim that "competition" is the natural law of economic relations. Still others, noting the unquestionable fact of the great differences in ability among men, declare that the pleasant things in life belong to the skilled and the clever, who should, they say, rule over the majority for the common good. These are all theories of "interdependence," despite the fact that they are partisan interpretations marked with self-interest.

Even a "true" interpretation of interdependence offers certain difficulties. If the world is peopled by both "old" and "young" souls, then what should be the rule of orderly relationships between the two? What are the adjustments which ought to be attempted when those who think themselves wiser than their fellows grow arrogant and presumptuous in power? Or when those who have been held in subjection, on the theory that they are late arrivals on the scene, break out in barbarous revolt, angrily destroying the works of civilization and the refinements of a more sophisticated way of life?

These, we may say to ourselves, are "political" questions, as, indeed, they nearly always become. But before they are political questions, they are moral and philosophical questions—questions which naturally haunt the minds of men who are puzzled by the incongruities and seeming injustices of life in human society. Interdependence, we soon see on reflection, is enormously complicated by the varied meanings which

may be given to such a principle by beings who are as capable of criminal egotism as they are of self-effacement and service to others.

Since man has a dual nature, nearly every phase of his psychological life is subject to the polarities of higher and lower Manas. Take for example the matter of self-reliance, which is inevitably related to interdependence. Essentially, self-reliance is practiced according to what the individual feels and thinks about his "self." When the idea of self is philosophic—when, that is, a man thinks of himself as a center of consciousness which is uniquely individual, yet at the same time united in what may be called his "infinite" dimension with all other selves—there will be perception of the subtleties which are involved. In such case, the man will see no contradiction between assuming personal responsibility for all his actions, and endeavoring to learn what others may teach him.

On the other hand, self-reliance personally conceived is haunted by the insecurities of egotism. To learn from others, to listen to what another may say, will often appear, from the personal point of view, to be a confession of weakness. How, the personality will ask, can I be independent and free if I concede that another may know better than I what to do? That other, doubtless, does *not* know better what he should do, and would not, if wise, presume to offer that kind of advice; it is the fault of the personality to "take personally" what comes from others, instead of trying to master its meaning before judging whether or not it is acceptable.

Sometimes a man susceptible to personal reactions will decide that he has been too much influenced by the opinions of other people—those whom he formerly respected, and doubtless respected "too much," or in a personally demeaning way—and that he must now break away from this confining influence. In these circumstances, there is a tendency to make decisions simply on the ground of where a suggestion comes from, instead of considering the quality of the suggestion. Yet this stubbornness of mind is as "personal" and weakening as the former servile attitude. It is only the other pole of the personal attitude toward self.

There are cases when a lack of psychological courage causes people to "go along" with a person or policy they don't quite agree with, and then, when they "can't stand it any longer," break out in deep resentment with bitter condemnations of their former guide. But this reaction

is little more than a further confession of insecurity. The anger betrays their own sense of having previously been inadequate—of not having been especially honest in the past. If the person they now condemn took advantage of their passivity, then they, by allowing this, encouraged *him* in his mistake. On the other hand, if their present bitterness is no more than a disguised form of self-disgust, their injustice to one who tried to help them offends to just the degree of their animosity against him.

In the final analysis, a man may hold morally accountable no one besides himself. This is the egoic aspect of self-reliance. So long as it is absent, the oscillations of personality will confuse the issues of both self-reliance and interdependence, with unrelieved misery the portion of the one who so wrestles with himself.

What we know of the behavior of Great Teachers ought to throw a light on problems of this sort. So often, when importuned by disciples, the teacher remains silent. In this case, we may suppose, the teacher recognizes that here is a question the answer to which cannot be dealt with self-reliantly by the disciple. Even Arjuna, that paragon of pupils, grew captious toward Krishna at a certain stage of his instruction. Then there is the *mood* of the questioner to be considered, as well as the question. We need not attempt to draw on occult relationships for illustrations, since the family life is so rich in problems of this sort. Within the family circle, the "reserves" of human relations are often abandoned because of the intimacy existing between the members of the family. Husbands permit themselves a petulance they would be ashamed of elsewhere, and wives exhibit the corresponding weaknesses which, outside the family, they would at least hide, if not overcome. The visitor to the home of another family quickly sees the quality of human relations which prevail—for here the actualities of self-reliance and interdependence, as practiced with a minimum of either pretense or restraint, are plainly evident. And this explains, perhaps, why the experience of the family life is held to be so precious to the self-education of the ego.

The interdependence, then, of human beings, comprehends endless subtleties to be studied and understood. Hence the injunction to self-study—so that, as the wise have counselled, we may learn to raise the self by the Self, thus growing into the larger life of soul.

IS DENUNCIATION A DUTY?

By H. P. BLAVATSKY

"Condemn no man in his absence; and when forced to reprove, do so to his face, but gently, and in words full of charity and compassion. For the human heart is like the Kusuli plant: it opens its cup to the sweet morning dew, and closes it before a heavy shower of rain."

—BUDDHIST PRECEPT

"Judge not, that ye be not judged."

—CHRISTIAN APHORISM

NOT a few of our most earnest Theosophists feel themselves, we are sorry to hear, between the horns of a dilemma. Small causes will at times produce great results. There are those who would jest under the cruelest operation, and remain cool while having a leg amputated, who would yet raise a storm and renounce their rightful place in the kingdom of Heaven if, to preserve it, they had to keep silent when somebody treads on their corns.

In the 13th number of LUCIFER (September, page 63), a paper on "The Meaning of a Pledge" was published. Out of the seven articles (six only were given out) which constitute the entire Pledge, the 1st, 4th, 5th, and especially the 6th, require great moral strength of character, an iron will added to much unselfishness, quick readiness for renunciation and even self-sacrifice, to carry out such a covenant. Yet scores of Theosophists have cheerfully signed this solemn "Promise" to work for the good of Humanity forgetful of Self, without one word of protest—save on one point. Strange to say, it is rule the third which in almost every case makes the applicant hesitate and show the white feather. *Ante tubam trepidat:* the best and kindest of them feels alarmed; and he is as overawed before the blast of the trumpet of that third clause, as though he dreaded for himself the fate of the walls of Jericho!

What is then this *terrible* pledge, to carry out which seems to be above the strength of the average mortal? Simply this:—

"I PLEDGE MYSELF NEVER TO LISTEN WITHOUT PROTEST TO ANY EVIL THING SPOKEN OF A BROTHER THEOSOPHIST, AND TO ABSTAIN FROM CONDEMNING OTHERS."

NOTE.—This article first appeared in *Lucifer* for December, 1888, and was last reprinted in THEOSOPHY for June, 1941.

To practice this golden rule seems quite easy. To listen without protest to evil said of *any one* is an action which has been despised ever since the remotest days of Paganism.

"To hear an open slander is a curse,
But not to find an answer is a worse," . . .

says Ovid. For one thing, perhaps, as pointedly remarked by Juvenal, because:—

"Slander, that worst of poisons, ever finds
An easy entrance *to ignoble minds*" . . .

—and because *in antiquity,* few liked to pass for such—minds. But now! . . .

In fact, the duty of defending a fellow-man stung by a poisonous tongue during his absence, and to abstain, in general, "from condemning others" is the very life and soul of practical theosophy, for such action is the handmaiden who conducts one into the narrow Path of the "higher life," that life which leads to the goal we all crave to attain. Mercy, Charity and Hope are the three goddesses who preside over that "life." To "abstain" from condemning our fellow beings is the tacit assertion of the presence in us of the three divine Sisters; to condemn on "hearsay" shows their absence. "Listen not to a tale bearer or slanderer," says Socrates. "For, as he discovereth of the secrets of others, so he will thine in turn." Nor is it difficult to avoid slandermongers. Where there is no demand, supply will very soon cease. "When people refrain from *evil-hearing,* then evil speakers will refrain from evil-talking," says a proverb. To condemn is to glorify oneself over the man one condemns. Pharisees of every nation have been constantly doing it since the evolution of intolerant religions. Shall we do as they?

We may be told, perhaps, that we ourselves are the first to break the ethical law we are upholding. That our theosophical periodicals are full of "denunciations," and LUCIFER lowers his torch to throw light on every evil, to the best of his ability. We reply—this is quite another thing. We denounce indignantly systems and organizations, evils, social and religious—*cant* above all: we abstain from denouncing persons. The latter are the children of their century, the victims of their environment and of the Spirit of the Age. To condemn and dishonour a man instead of pitying and trying to help him, because, being born in a community of lepers he is a leper himself, is like cursing a room because it is dark, instead of quietly lighting a candle to disperse the

gloom. "Ill deeds are doubled with an evil word"; nor can a general evil be avoided or removed by doing evil oneself and choosing a scapegoat for the atonement of the sins of a whole community. Hence, we denounce these communities, not their units; we point out the rottenness of our boasted civilization, indicate the pernicious systems of education which lead to it, and show the fatal effects of these on the masses. Nor are we more partial to ourselves. Ready to lay down our life any day for THEOSOPHY—that great cause of the Universal Brotherhood for which we live and breathe—and willing to shield, if need be, every true theosophist with our own body, we yet denounce as openly and as virulently the distortion of the original lines upon which the Theosophical Society was primarily built, and the gradual loosening and undermining of the original system by the sophistry of many of its highest officers. We bear our Karma for our lack of humility during the early days of the Theosophical Society; for our favorite aphorism: "See, how these Christians love each other" has now to be paraphrased daily, and almost hourly, into: "Behold, how our Theosophists love each other." And we tremble at the thought that, unless many of our ways and customs, in the Theosophical Society at large, are amended or done away with, LUCIFER will one day have to expose many a blot on our own scutcheon—*e.g.,* worship of Self, uncharitableness, and sacrificing to one's personal vanity the welfare of other Theosophists —more "fiercely" than it has ever denounced the various shams and abuses of power in state Churches and Modern Society.

Nevertheless, there are theosophists, who forgetting the beam in their own eye, seriously believe it their duty to denounce every mote they perceive in the eye of their neighbor. Thus, one of our most estimable, hard-working, and noble-minded members writes, with regard to the said 3rd clause:—

> "The 'Pledge' binds the taker never to speak evil of anyone. But I believe that there are occasions when severe denunciation is a duty to truth. There are cases of treachery, falsehood, rascality in private life which should be denounced by those who are certain of them; and there are cases in public life of venality and debasement which good citizens are bound to lash unsparingly. Theosophic culture would not be a boon to the world if it enforced unmanliness, weakness, flabbiness of moral texture." . . .

We are sincerely sorry to find a most worthy brother holding such mistaken views. First of all, poor is that theosophic culture which fails

to transform simply a "good citizen" of his own native country into a "good citizen" of the world. A true theosophist must be a cosmopolitan in his heart. He must embrace mankind, the whole of humanity in his philanthropic feelings. It is higher and far nobler to be one of those who love their fellow men, without distinction of race, creed, caste or color, than to be merely a good patriot, or still less, a partizan. To mete one measure for all, is holier and more divine than to help one's country in its private ambition of aggrandizement, strife or bloody wars in the name of GREEDINESS and SELFISHNESS. "Severe denunciation is a duty to truth." It is; on condition, however, that one should denounce and fight against the *root* of evil and not expend one's fury by knocking down the irresponsible blossoms of its plant. The wise horticulturist uproots the parasitic herbs, and will hardly lose time in using his garden shears to cut off the heads of the poisonous weeds. If a theosophist happens to be a public officer, a judge or magistrate, a barrister or even a preacher, it is then, of course his duty to his country, his conscience and those who put their trust in him, to "denounce severely" every case of "treachery, falsehood and rascality" *even* in private life; but—*nota bene*—only if he is appealed to and called to exercise his legal authority, not otherwise. This is neither "speaking evil" nor "condemning," but truly working for humanity; seeking to preserve society, which is a portion of it, from being imposed upon, and protecting the property of the citizens entrusted to their care as public officers, from being recklessly taken away. But even then the theosophist may assert himself in the magistrate, and show his mercy by repeating after Shakespeare's severe judge: "I show it most of all when I show justice."

But what has a "working" member of the Theosophical Society independent of any public function or office, and who is neither judge, public prosecutor nor preacher, to do with the misdeeds of his neighbors? If a member of the T.S. is found guilty of one of the above enumerated or some still worse crime, and if another member becomes possessed of irrefutable evidence to that effect, it may become his painful duty to bring the same under the notice of the Council of his Branch. Our Society has to be protected, as also its numerous members. This, again, would only be simple justice. A natural and truthful statement of facts cannot be regarded as "evil speaking" or as a condemnation of one's brother. Between this, however, and deliberate backbiting there is a wide chasm. Clause 3 concerns only those who being in no way

responsible for their neighbor's actions or walk in life, will yet judge and condemn them on every opportunity. And in such case it becomes —"slander" and "evil speaking."

This is how we understand the clause in question; nor do we believe that by enforcing it "theosophic culture" enforces "unmanliness, weakness or flabbiness of moral texture," but the reverse. True courage has naught to do, we trust, with denunciation; and there is little manliness in criticizing and condemning one's fellow men behind their backs, whether for wrongs done to others or injury to ourselves. Shall we regard the unparalleled virtues inculcated by Gautama the Buddha, or the Jesus of the Gospels as "unmanliness"? Then the ethics preached by the former, that *moral code* which Professor Max Müller, Burnouf and even Barthelémy St. Hilaire have unanimously pronounced *the most perfect which the world has ever known,* must be no better than meaningless words, and the Sermon on the Mount had better never have been written at all. Does our correspondent regard the teaching of non-resistance to evil, kindness to all creatures, and the sacrifice of one's own self for the good of others as weakness or unmanliness? Are the commands, "Judge not that ye be not judged," and, "Put back thy sword, for they who take the sword shall perish with the sword," to be viewed as "flabbiness of moral texture" or as *the voice of Karma?*

But our correspondent is not alone in his way of thinking. Many are the men and women, good, charitable, self-sacrificing and trustworthy in every other respect, and who accept unhesitatingly every other clause of the "Pledge," who feel uneasy and almost tremble before this special article. But why? The answer is easy: simply *because they fear an unconscious* (to them), *almost unavoidable* PERJURY.

The moral of the fable and its conclusion are suggestive. It is a direct blow in the face of Christian education and our civilized modern society in all its circles and in every *Christian* land. So deep has this moral cancer—the habit of speaking uncharitably of our neighbor and brother at every opportunity—eaten into the heart of all the classes of Society, from the lowest to the very highest, that it has led the best of its members to feel diffident of their tongues! They *dare not trust themselves* to abstain from condemning others—from mere force of habit. This is quite an ominous "sign of the times."

Indeed, most of us, of whatever nationality, are born and brought up in a thick atmosphere of gossip, uncharitable criticism and wholesale condemnation. Our education in this direction begins in the nursery, where the head nurse hates the governess, the latter hates the mistress, and the servants, regardless of the presence of "baby" and the children, grumble incessantly against the masters, find fault with each other, and pass impudent remarks on every visitor. The same training follows us in the class room, whether at home or at a public school. It reaches its apex of ethical development during the years of our education and practical religious instruction. We are soaked through and through with the conviction that, though ourselves "born in sin and total depravity," *our* religion is the only one to save us from eternal damnation, while the rest of mankind is predestined from the depths of eternity to inextinguishable hell-fires. We are taught that slander of every other people's Gods and religion is a sign of reverence for our own idols, and is a meritorious action. The "Lord God," himself, the "*personal* Absolute," is impressed upon our young plastic minds as ever backbiting and condemning those he created, as cursing the stiff-necked Jew and *tempting* the Gentile.

For years the minds of young Protestants are periodically enriched with the choicest curses from the *Commination* service in their prayer-books, or the "denouncing of God's anger and judgments against sinners," besides eternal condemnation for most creatures; and from his birth the young Roman Catholic constantly hears threats of curse and excommunication by his Church. It is in the Bible and Church of England prayer-books that boys and girls of all classes learn of the existence of vices, the mention of which, in the works of Zola, falls under the ban of law as immoral and depraving, but to the enumeration and the *cursing* of which in the Churches, young and old are made to say "Amen," after the minister of the meek and humble Jesus. The latter says, Swear *not,* curse *not,* condemn *not,* but "love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate and persecute you." But the canon of the church and the clergyman tell them: Not at all. There are crimes and vices "for which ye affirm with your own mouths the curse of God to be due." (*Vide* "Commination Service.") What wonder that later in life, Christians piously try to emulate "God" and the priest, since their ears are still ringing with, "*Cursed be he* that removeth his neighbor's landmark," and "Cursed be he" who does this,

that or the other, even "he that putteth his trust in man" (!), and with "God's" judgment and condemnations. They judge and condemn right and left, indulging in wholesale slander and "comminating" on their own account. Do they forget that in the last curse—the *anathema* against adulterers and drunkards, idolaters and extortionists—"the UNMERCIFUL and SLANDERERS" are included? And that by having joined in the solemn "amen" after this last *Christian* thunderbolt, *they have affirmed "with their own mouths the curse of God to be due"* on their own sinful heads?

But this seems to trouble our society slanderers very little. For no sooner are the religiously brought up children of church-going people off their school benches, than they are taken in hand by those who preceded them. Coached for their final examination in that school for scandal, called the world, by older and more experienced tongues, to pass Master of Arts in the science of cant and commination, a respectable member of society has but to join a religious congregation, to become a churchwarden or lady patroness.

Who shall dare deny that in our age, modern society in its general aspect has become a vast arena for such moral murders, performed between two cups of five o'clock tea and amid merry jests and laughter? Society is now more than ever a kind of international shambles wherein, under the waving banners of drawing-room and church Christianity and the cultured tittle-tattle of the world, each becomes in turn as soon as his back is turned, the sacrificial victim, the sin-offering for atonement, whose singed flesh smells savory in the nostrils of Mrs. Grundy. Let us pray, brethren, and render thanks to the God of Abraham and of Isaac that we no longer live in the days of cruel Nero. And, oh! let us feel grateful that we no longer live in danger of being ushered into the arena of the Colosseum, to die there a comparatively quick death under the claws of the hungry wild beasts! It is the boast of Christianity that our ways and customs have been wonderfully softened under the beneficent shadow of the Cross. Yet we have but to step into a modern drawing-room to find a symbolical representation, true to life, of the same wild beasts feasting on, and gloating over, the mangled carcases of their best friends. Look at those graceful and as ferocious great cats, who with sweet smiles and an innocent eye sharpen their rose-colored claws preparatory to playing at mouse and cat. Woe to the poor mouse fastened upon by those proud Society *felidae!* The mouse will be made

to bleed for years before being permitted to bleed to death. The victims will have to undergo unheard-of moral martyrdom, to learn through papers and *friends* that they have been guilty at one or another time of life of each and all of the vices and crimes enumerated in the Commination Service, until, to avoid further persecution, the said mice themselves turn into ferocious society cats, and make other mice tremble in their turn. Which of the two arenas is preferable, my brethren—that of the old pagan or that of Christian lands?

Addison had not words of contempt sufficiently strong to rebuke this Society gossip of the worldly Cains of both sexes.

> "How frequently," he exclaims, "is the honesty and integrity of a man disposed of by a smile or a shrug? How many good and generous actions have been sunk into oblivion by a distrustful look, or stamped with the imputation of proceeding from bad motives, by a mysterious and seasonable whisper. Look . . . how large a portion of chastity is sent out of the world by distant hints—nodded away, and cruelly winked into suspicion by the envy of those who are past all temptation of it themselves. How often does the reputation of a helpless creature bleed by a report—which the party who is at the pains to propagate it beholds with much pity and fellow-feeling—that she is heartily sorry for it—hopes in God it is not true!"

From Addison we pass to Sterne's treatment of the same subject. He seems to continue this picture by saying:

> "So fruitful is slander in variety of expedients to satiate as well as to disguise itself, that if those smoother weapons cut so sore, what shall we say of open and unblushing scandal, subjected to no caution, tied down to no restraints? If the one like an arrow shot in the dark, does, nevertheless, so much secret mischief, this, like pestilence, which rages at noonday, sweeps all before it, levelling without distinction the good and the bad; a thousand fall beside it, and ten thousand on its right hand; they fall, so rent and torn in this tender part of them, so unmercifully butchered, as sometimes never to recover either the wounds or the anguish of heart which they have occasioned."

Such are the results of slander, and from the standpoint of Karma, many such cases *amount to more than murder in hot blood.* Therefore, those who want to lead the "higher life" among the "*working* Fellows," of the Theosophical Society must bind themselves by this solemn pledge, or, remain *droning* members. It is not to the latter that these pages are addressed, nor would they feel interested in that question, nor is it an advice offered to the F.'s T.S. at large. For the "Pledge" under discussion is taken only by those Fellows who begin to be referred

in our circles of "Lodges" as the "working" members of the T.S. All others, that is to say those Fellows who prefer to remain ornamental, and belong to the "mutual admiration" groups; or those who, having joined out of mere curiosity, have, without severing their connection with the Society, quietly dropped off; or those, again, who have preserved only a skin deep interest (if any), a luke-warm sympathy for the movement—and such constitute the majority in England—need burden themselves with no such pledge. Having been for years the "Greek Chorus" in the busy drama enacted, now known as the Theosophical Society, they prefer remaining as they are. The "chorus," considering its numbers, has only, as in the past, to look on at what takes place in the action of the *dramatis personae* and it is only required to express occasionally its sentiments by repeating the closing gems from the monologues of the actors, or remain silent—at their option. "Philosophers of a day," as Carlyle calls them, they neither desire, nor are they desired "to apply." Therefore, even were these lines to meet their eye, they are respectfully begged to remember that what is said does not refer to either of the above enumerated classes of Fellows. Most of them have joined the Society as they would have bought a guinea book. Attracted by the novelty of the binding, they opened it; and, after glancing over contents and title, motto and dedication, they have put it away on a back shelf, and thought of it no more. They have a right to the volume, by virtue of their purchase, but would refer to it no more than they would to an antiquated piece of furniture relegated to the lumber-room, because the seat of it is not comfortable enough, or is out of proportion with their moral and intellectual size. A hundred to one these members will not even see LUCIFER, for it has now become a matter of theosophical statistics, that *more than two thirds* of its subscribers are non-theosophists. Nor are the elder brothers of LUCIFER—the Madras "Theosophist," the New York "Path," the French "Lotus," nor even the marvellously cheap and international "T.P.S." (of 7, Duke Street, Adelphi), any luckier than we are. Like all prophets, they are not without honor, save in their own countries, and their voices in the fields of Theosophy are truly "the voice of one crying in the wilderness." This is no exaggeration. Among the respective subscribers of those various Theosophical periodicals, the members of the T.S., *whose organs they are,* and for whose sole benefit they were started (their editors, managers, and the whole staff of constant contributors working

gratis, and paying furthermore out of their own generally meager pockets, printers, publishers and occasional contributors), are on the average 15 *per cent.* This is also a sign of the times, and shows the difference between the "working" and the "resting" theosophists.

We must not close without once more addressing the former. Who of these will undertake to maintain that clause 3 is not a fundamental principle of the code of ethics which ought to guide every theosophist aspiring *to become one in reality?* For such a large body of men and women, composed of the most heterogeneous nationalities, characters, creeds and ways of thinking, furnishing for this very reason such easy pretexts for disputes and strife, ought not this clause to become part and parcel of the obligation of each member—working or ornamental—who joins the Theosophical movement? We think so, and leave it to the future consideration of the representatives of the General Council, who meet at the next anniversary at Adyar. In a Society with pretensions to an exalted system of ethics—the essence of all previous ethical codes—which confesses openly its aspirations to emulate and put to shame by its practical example and ways of living the followers of every religion, such a pledge constitutes the *sine quâ non* of the success of that Society. In a gathering where "near the noisome nettle blooms the rose," and where fierce thorns are more plentiful than sweet blossoms, a pledge of such a nature is *the sole salvation.* No Ethics as a science of mutual duties—whether social, religious or philosophical—*from man to man,* can be called complete or consistent unless such a rule is enforced. Not only this, but if we would not have our Society become *de facto* and *de jure* a gigantic sham parading under its banner of "Universal Brotherhood"—we ought to follow every time the breaking of this *law of laws,* by the expulsion of the slanderer. No honest man, still less a theosophist, can disregard these lines of Horace:—

> "He that shall rail against his absent friends,
> Or hears them scandalised, and not defends;
> Tells tales, and brings his friend in disesteem;
> That man's a KNAVE—be sure beware of him."

IS CONDEMNATION A DUTY?

FIRST, I fail to see that in order to train the moral sense one has to practise condemnation of others. *Second,* The *necessity* for condemnation will never pass away if we occupy ourselves in such practise while waiting for the world to grow so good that there will be no one to condemn. *Third,* It appears to me to be a new and untheosophical doctrine that our moral sense is to be or can be properly cultivated by engaging in condemnation of others.

The maxim cited was intended solely for earnest disciples who endeavor to follow the very highest rules of conduct. We are so prone to condemn others and let our own faults go by that sincere disciples are taught, as a discipline, to cultivate their moral sense by inspecting their own faults, and let others do the same for themselves, but when the occasion demands condemnation, that it shall be of the wrong act. This cannot apply to a judge, or any other proper inquisitor, teacher, or guide. It is meant solely for those who, believing that our span of life is so short that there will be no time left if we busy ourselves with faults of others, prefer to improve their opportunity by purging themselves, by cleaning their own doorway, by taking the beam out of their own eye. For all sages and occult practitioners declare that among the necessary facts to be known is the fact that each time a man indulges in condemnation of another he is himself prevented by his own act from seeing his own faults, and that sooner or later his faults increase. If a sincere student thinks this be true he will hesitate about others and occupy himself with self-examination and self-conquest. This will take all of his time. We are not born as universal reformers of all people's faults and abuses, and theosophists can not waste their energies in criticasting others. Furthermore, I strongly doubt if anyone was ever improved by the fault-finding of his acquaintances. It is natural discipline that makes the improvement, and that only. Indeed, I have observed in much experience with those who constantly criticise others that nothing results in 99 cases out of 100 but a smirking self-satisfaction in the breast of the critic, and anger or contempt in the heart of the victim of the fault-finding.

—W.Q.J., in *The Theosophical Forum,* January, 1891

WORD PUZZLES

SO far, in this series of notes upon word meanings and usages, we are led repeatedly to a peculiar observation—that words in the Theosophist's lexicon are apt to have developed a duality of meaning, according to time, place and usage. "Altruism," "absolute" and "abstract" are good examples, since when used by the Theosophist's detractors they carry with them a tone of disdain, and when used by the Theosophist, in the sense intended by H.P.B., serve oppositely—as affirmations of the existence of the higher Self within the body of physical man. Ormuzd and Ahriman are not only always with us—they live, so to speak, even in our habits and connotations of speech. Words, like philosophical teachings, often have esoteric meanings which vie, within the consciousness of man, with their distorted counterparts.

Such observations impel one to wonder if all human speech does not indeed have two dimensions. A word or a phrase is of itself equivocal or bifocal, and contains no clear meaning until vitalized by the thought-current of a rational man. Wandering at random among the "A's," for instance, and pausing over the term "academy," we find that this word, most often now found affixed to military boarding schools, first came into use in reference to Plato and his disciples. Plato held symposia in a grove of trees near Athens, known as the Academia. But Plato, unlike instructors in the military schools of our day, did not seek to impart specific learning so much as he endeavored to awaken the evaluative capacities of his students. The symposium of Plato's academy was an occasion for *free* thought, in contradistinction to all rigid lines of indoctrination.

There are, of course, a few notable exceptions to the prevailing authoritarian connotations of "academy," as in the case of the New York Academy of Science, which is at least theoretically based upon a desire to encourage synthesis of evaluative thinking rather than indoctrination. Usually, however, it is the authoritarian definition of academy which comes first to mind. Thus, while a man may respect his universities and send them his children for the obtaining of a "liberal" education, whenever the word academic is heard or employed it is felt to be synonymous with the trappings of intellectual authority. An academician, moreover, is a dull fellow, we feel, secure in the speaking

of his own special language and caring little about the problems, moral or otherwise, of the workaday world.

If the original Platonic usage of academy were still current, however, our professors and teachers would be more likely to consider themselves as discussion leaders and companions than as authoritative instructors. And an important discipline could yet be undertaken by the university, if it were a discipline enjoined, through example, by those who insist upon conversing only with carefully formed sentences and well-rounded ideas. Historically, then, a too formalized employment of intellectual discipline leads to a reaction against *all* intellectuality, encouraging such oft-repeated sentiments as "I don't care much for these intellectuals; give me a man with a good heart."

When Plato selected the grove known as the Academia, utilizing its leafy arbors to shelter Pythagorean discourse, he found it already named in mythology. As one word-origin expert describes it, the Academia received its name from a farmer named Academus who, in a famous legend, showed the twin brothers Castor and Pollux where to look for their kidnapped sister, Helen of Troy. As a farmer, perhaps, Academus represents that unobtrusive knowingness which many associate with "qualities of heart," as opposed to spectacular accomplishments of the intellect. Meanwhile Castor and Pollux are, as H.P.B. explained, in turn symbols of the dual nature of man—Castor representing the lower psychological self, and Pollux representing that aspect of mind which received its spark from Zeus, King of the Gods.

When Pollux found his brother dying, he willingly sacrificed his own membership in a "divine race" in order to bestow upon his stricken twin a semi-immortality; he agreed to share his brother's fate in all things, and thus, according to H.P.B. "must pass half his existence underground, and the other half (only) in the golden heavenly abodes." Thus, through the spirit of sacrifice, Castor, as well as Pollux, became *semi*-divine. Yet for them to fulfill their functions as helpers of humankind they needed to recognize kinship with those of humbler origin. Descending into the affairs of men in a search for Helen (perhaps herself symbolizing that higher spiritual intuition which simple men may share, at least at times, with Gods), they received and appreciated wisdom of a necessary earthly sort, as proffered by Academus. We may wonder, then, if Plato did not find his grove by a "natural

karma"—a grove appropriately named to signify his attempts to synthesize divine and human thought through the agency of philosophy.

Incidentally, just as Plato was a special sort of "academician," so was he also a special sort of "agnostic," so far as modern usage of the latter word is concerned. While it was Thomas Huxley who added "agnostic" to the English vocabulary, and although Huxley coined the word as a means of expressing the views of one who doubted that direct knowledge could be gained by mystical means, we find Saint Paul using *agnostic* in a different sense. In *Acts* 17:23, Paul speaks, mystically, of the altar to the "unknown God" (*agnostico theo*). Here the implication is that those who believe that the deific principle must necessarily be beyond the grasp of the corporeal mind come closest to its realization, and the sentiment is the same as that expressed in the *Upanishads.* Huxley actually had something in common, then, with the Vedic philosophers, and with Plato—who felt that it is best to not approach the more recondite mysteries by asserted definitions and instructions, but rather, *suggestively,* through myth and allegory. Yet Plato certainly made much of the discipline of logic, and the Socratic search for values is one in which rational processes of thought are clarified. It is only on the subject of the *Good* and the *Gods* that Plato leans toward vague allusions, forsaking definitive "arguments."

"I invented the title of agnostic," wrote Huxley. "It came into my head as suggestively antithetic to the 'gnostic' of church history, who professed to know so very much." Thus it is revealed that Huxley and all the other skeptics of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries who disliked the connotations of gnosticism were principally protesting the extravagance of certain specific claims to personal knowledge. Ideally, it would seem to us, the word agnostic should be much more carefully removed from proximity to the term skepticism than is the case in most modern usage. For the agnostic *may* be sure that a higher knowledge and wisdom exists, but is not presumptuous enough to claim that he has attained or may possess all of it; he is perhaps too much aware of his incapacity to define and circumscribe it. While medieval philosophers discuss "God" with assurance, and "God's wisdom" with only a slightly less pontifical air, the Platonic philosophers recognized that revelations from the deity within—since they come in a language different from that of the pure intellect—cannot be conveyed in doctrinal terms.

But neither Saint Paul nor Plato was a skeptic. Neither doubted the existence of truth, nor the ultimate capacity of man to apprehend and assimilate that truth, while they *did* doubt the personal claims of religious votaries to complete mastery of ultimate subjects. An always helpful "agnostic" quality of mind, then, could be argued to be that mental orientation which *neither* doubts *nor* accepts, but rather manages to forever retain a mood of what H.P.B. called "attentive expectancy." Doubt, or skepticism, actually spoils the more noble and refined aspect of agnosticism, for doubt is another sort of state of mind entirely —one wherein it is *expected* that something will be found wrong with the ideas or doctrines one is considering. Finally, then, it could even be said that the highest way to approach the *gnosis* is through Platonic *a*gnosticism.

The Theosophist, following in this tradition, attempts the orientation of Socrates, who never doubted the Gods nor his own ultimate capacity to converse with them, but *did* doubt, and that perpetually, the claim that either the State of Athens or he, himself, could reveal definite "godlike" wisdom to anyone else. Nonetheless, one needs, for philosophical discussion, that preciseness of language and conceptual structure which is characteristic of both Socrates and Plato. Thus, he can find a real respect for the word "academic"—when used properly. The niceties of logic are sometimes more than just niceties, and play an important role in helping each to rid himself of false or limited conceptions.

The very nature and design of religion, if I may so express it, prove, even to demonstration, that it must be free from every thing of mystery, and unincumbered with every thing that is mysterious. Religion, considered as a duty, is incumbent upon every living soul alike, and, therefore, must be on a level to the understanding and comprehension of all. Man does not learn religion as he learns the secrets and mysteries of a trade. He learns the theory of religion by reflection. It arises out of the action of his own mind upon the things which he sees, or upon what he may happen to hear or to read, and the practice joins itself thereto.

—THOMAS PAINE

BHUMI'S OCCULT PROGENY

> It is stated in the Zohar that the primordial worlds (sparks) could not continue because *man was not yet*. The human form contains everything; and as it did not yet exist, the worlds were destroyed.
>
> —*The Secret Doctrine*

THE Monad has to pass through its mineral, vegetable, and animal forms, before the Light of the Logos is awakened in the animal man. Till this awakening the animal man cannot be referred to as "MAN" but has to be regarded as a Monad imprisoned in ever changing forms. The monadic essence begins imperceptibly to differentiate towards individual consciousness in the vegetable kingdom. The tendency toward segregation into individual monads is gradual, and in the higher animals comes almost to the point. The "human" monad, whether immetallized in the stone atom, or invegetallized in the plant, or inanimalized in the animal, is still ever a divine, hence a *human* monad. It ceases to be human only when it becomes *absolutely divine*.

The difference between man and animal is not that he has one principle more than the tiniest insect, but because man is a perfected animal, the vehicle of a fully developed monad, self-conscious and deliberately following its own line of progress, whereas in the insect, and in the higher animals, the higher triad of principles is absolutely dormant as a functioning basis for action. Man belongs to a kingdom distinctly separate from that of the animal. That he was not the last member of the mammalian family, but the first in this Round, is something that science will be forced to acknowledge one day. Physical nature, when left to herself in the creation of animal and man, fails. She can produce the first two, mineral and vegetable, and the lower animal, kingdoms. But when it comes to man, spiritual, independent and intelligent powers are required for his creation—besides the "coats of skin" and the "breath of animal Life."

The human monads of preceding Rounds needed something higher than purely physical materials to build their personalities with, under the penalty of remaining even below any "Frankenstein" animal. To construct a thinking man, "living Fire" is needed, that fire which gives the human mind its self-perception and self-consciousness, or Manas.

NOTE.—Collated principally from standard Theosophical writings.

This explains the mystery of and fills the gap below, the informing principle in man—the higher self or human monad—and the animal monad, both one and the same, although the former is endowed with *divine* intelligence, the latter with *instinctual* faculty alone. Man needs four flames and three fires to become one on Earth, and he requires the essence of the forty-nine Fires to become perfect. The four flames and three fires correspond to the four lower and three higher human principles. The *Zohar,* repeating the archaic teaching, distinctly says that the real man is the Soul, and his material form no part of him.

The human type is the repository of all potential organic forms, and the central point from which these latter radiate. Having appeared at the very beginning, at the head of sentient and conscious life, man becomes the living animal UNIT, from whom the "cast-off clothes" determine the shape of every life and animal in this Round. Owing to the very type of his development, man cannot descend from either ape or an ancestor common to both, but shows his origin from a type far superior to himself, and this type is the "Heavenly Man"—the Dhyan Chohans. Man was the storehouse, so to speak, of all the seeds of life for this Round, vegetable and animal alike. All the forms which now people the earth, are so many variations on *basic types* originally thrown off by the MAN of the third and fourth Round. The astral prototypes of the mineral, vegetable, and animal kingdoms up to man . . . are re-formed out of the cast-off materials of the preceding Round. The basic types were few in number in comparison with the multitude of organisms to which they ultimately give rise. But a general unity of type has, nevertheless, been preserved throughout the ages.

In the first chapter of Genesis, animals, whales and fowl of the air are created before the androgyne Adam. In the second, Adam (the sexless) comes first, and the animals only appear after him. This first creation is an allegorical reference to the "Sacred Animals" of the Zodiac and other heavenly bodies. Some Kabalists see in them the prototypes of the animals. The prototypes or ideas of things exist first on the plane of Divine eternal Consciousness, and thence become reflected in the Astral Light. There are hierarchies of Builders of form, and series of forms and degrees, from the highest to the lowest. While the higher are shaped under the guidance of the "Builders," the gods, "Cosmocratores"; the latter are fashioned by the elemental and nature spirits.

It is stated that there are seven kingdoms. The first group comprises three degrees of elemental, or nascent centers of force—from the first stage of differentiation from primordial homogeneous matter to its third degree—*i.e.,* from full unconsciousness to semi-perception. The second or higher group embraces the kingdoms from vegetable to man; the mineral kingdom thus forming the central or turning point in the degrees of the monadic essence, considered as an evoluting energy. Three stages sub-physical on the elemental side; the mineral kingdom; three stages on the physical side—these are the (first or preliminary) seven links of the evolutionary chain. In the earlier ages, when astral evolution was alone in progress . . . the two planes, the astral and the physical, though developing on lines that ran parallel with one another even into the earliest geological ages, yet had no direct point of contact. They were not in the same phase of manifestation in which they are *now.*

In reality, as Occult philosophy teaches us, everything which changes is organic; it has the life principle in it, and it has all the potentiality of the higher lives. All in nature is an aspect of the one element, life is universal, there can be no such thing as an inorganic atom. Matter thought to be inorganic is but an indication of the life-principle in profound latency. The simplest monad, a microscopical point of protoplasm, formless and structureless, exhibits yet all the essential vital functions, alimentation, growth, breeding, motion, feeling, and sensuous perception, and even such functions which replace "consciousness"—the soul of the higher animals. Even crystals undergo a process of accretion, which for them answers to the function of nutrition. H.P.B.'s Theosophy declares that every atom is alive and has the germ of self-consciousness. . . . What is now called human flesh is so much matter that one day was wholly mineral, later on vegetable, and now refined into human atoms. At a point of time very far from now the present, vegetable matter will have been raised to the animal stage and what we now use as our organic or fleshy matter will have changed by transformation into substance of the plane of mind. And so on up the scale until the time shall come when what is now known as mineral matter will have passed on to the human stage.

The Pythagorean doctrine of metempsychosis applies to the development of the human foetus, from the first instant of its physical appearance as a germ to its ultimate form and birth: a stone becomes a plant;

a plant, a beast; a beast, a man, etc. The process of human foetal growth epitomizes not only the general characteristics of the fourth, but of the third Round terrestrial life. During all these ages before *our* man came into being, evolution was carrying out the work of perfecting various powers which are now our possessions. This was accomplished by the Ego or real man going through experiences in countless conditions of matter all different one from the other. Occultists are at no loss to account for the birth of children with an actual caudal appendage, or for the fact that the tail in the human foetus is, at one period, double the length of the nascent legs. The potentiality of every organ useful to animal life is locked up in Man—the microcosm of the Macrocosm—and abnormal conditions may not unfrequently result in the strange phenomena which Darwinists regard as "reversion to ancestral features." The prototypes which man *shed* in the course of his astral development became useful appendages in the lower animals.

The whole order of nature evinces a progressive march towards *a higher life;* and spiral development proceeds in accord with the law of analogy and correspondence. As the foetus develops amidst the *liquor amnii* in the womb, so Earths germinate in the universal ether, or astral fluid, in the womb of the Universe. These cosmic children, like their pigmy inhabitants, are at first nuclei; then ovules; then gradually mature; and, becoming "mothers" in their turn, develop mineral, vegetable, animal and human forms. The embryo evolves in its pre-natal sphere, the individual in his family, the family in the state, the state in mankind, the Earth in our system, that system in its central universe, the universe in the Kosmos, and the Kosmos in the One Cause. Thus runs the philosophy of the Occultists.

Even on this plane of ours there are other and various intelligences, besides those of man, in creatures visible and invisible, from minds of subjective beings, high and low, to objective animals and the lowest organisms—in short, "from the Deva to the elephant, from the elemental to the ant." Elementals are attached only to the four elements of air, fire, water and earth, and only to the two lower kingdoms of nature, the mineral and vegetable; in which they immetalize and inherbalize. In relation to its own plane of conception and perception, the ant has as good an intellect as we have ourselves, and a better one. For though it cannot express it in words, yet, over and above instinct, the ant shows very high reasoning powers, as all of us know. The ant has

conceptions of time and space which are its own; concepts which are entirely on another plane. If a scientist could become an ant for a while, and talk as an ant, and remember his experiences on returning to his own sphere of consciousness, then only would he know something for certain of this interesting insect. As it is he can only speculate, making inferences from the ant's behaviour. We are on a higher scale of evolution than the ant, but, comparatively speaking, we are as ants to the plane above.

Occult science investigates the nature, power, and qualities of everything sublunary; of the elements and their parts, of animals, all varieties of plants and their fruits, of stones and herbs. It explores the essence and power of everything.

Plants have mystical properties in a most wonderful degree, and the secrets of the herbs of dreams and enchantments are only lost to European science—unknown to it except in a few marked instances, such as opium and hashish. Metals, woods and plants have all an affinity with, and bear a close relation to, the human organism. The idea of such a sympathetic power existing in plants, animals, and even stones, was once universal. Every plant without exception feels and has a consciousness of its own. From the gigantic tree down to the minutest fern or blade of grass, every plant has, Occultism teaches us, an elemental entity of which it is the outward clothing on this plane. Each plant has its Karma and its growth is the result of Karma. This Karma, it is said, proceeds from the lower Dhyan Chohans, who trace out and plan the growth of the tree.

During the higher spiritual cycles on earth—the occult powers of plants, animals, and minerals magnetically sympathize with the "superior natures," and the divine soul of man is in perfect harmony with those "inferior" ones. But during the barren period, the latter lose their magnetic sympathy, and the spiritual sight of the majority of mankind is so blinded as to lose every notion of the superior powers of its own divine spirit. There are well authenticated cases to show the existence of a mysterious sympathy between the life of certain plants and that of human beings. Persons have been known to fall sick simultaneously with the uprooting of a tree planted upon their natal day, dying when the tree dies. Reversing affairs, it has been known that a tree planted under the same circumstances withered and died simultaneously with the person whose psychic brother, so to speak, it was.

According to Paracelsus, plants are the earthly representations of astral influences, corresponding to the quality of the "stars." In medicines, that which is active is the astral element, which acts upon the astral man. It makes a great difference whether a medicine is pervaded by one influence or by another. By the judicious use of plants, beneficial astral influences may be attracted and evil influences neutralized.

A homoeopathic physician of this century, Dr. James Kent, thought it highly probable that there is a throwing off from the sick human race of influences which are subsequently absorbed by plants, and that plants will correspond to man in the region in which they grow. Another idea advanced is that in any particular region, the vegetable kingdom provides all that is necessary for curing disease in that region. Dr. Mure of Brazil taught that, in the mineral kingdom as well as among the plants of his region, man may find his remedy when sick. Homoeopathic philosophy, drawing upon its own experience of the occult affinities between man and medicines, endows medicine with a "soul" and expresses it in such terms as these: "*Drugs* are people, with whims, fancies and terrors; with temperaments and idiosyncrasies and characteristics. They stalk about the world speaking, and moving, and halting, with the bodies, minds and souls of men. . . . We all recognize, in the most common mental states, the 'gentleman with the gold-headed cane' in the fastidiousness of Arsenic; the irritations of Bryonia, Chamomilla, Nux Vomica; the gentle yielding, lachrymose Pulsatilla; the ever varying moods of Ignatia, the hauteur of Platina, the lack of self control of Silicea, the presentment of defeat of Apis, the want of natural affection of Sepia and Phosphorus, strange impulses to kill those dearest of Mercury and Nux; the suicidal promptings of China—not obvious and open like those of Natrum Sulph but hidden, shamefaced and mixed with fear! . . ."

All natural forms bear their signature, indicating their true nature. The forms of minerals, vegetables, and animals indicate their character. Man's character often belies his form. His character may have changed into that of an animal, his form retaining the human shape (Paracelsus). Up to almost modern times there were physicians of repute who held that the signature or physical properties of the vegetable or mineral medicines in many instances gives us the key to their remedial virtues. Thus, euphrasia (Eyebright) is a plant whose flower resembles the iris of the eye, and had been found especially useful for

dimness of vision. The elder branch, with its pith resembling the spinal marrow, was used in diseases of the spine; the lichen pulmonaria, shaped like the lung, was valuable in treatment of phthisis; cyclamen european, like the stomach, was used in stomach ailments. And so on, with varying resemblances and correspondences through a long and colorful list of flowers, herbs, roots. Paracelsus was one of those who made practical use of the art of signature reading in treating the sick. Fire Philosophers and alchemists, all the scoffing to the contrary, seem to have been possessors of the knowledge of the later physical sciences. They well knew that plants have nerves, sensations, and instincts, and they further insisted that each was endowed with its astral builder.

The Secret Doctrine unifies all the diverse relationships in the one monadic essence, irrespective of the "kingdom" under scientific analysis and scrutiny, pointing out the true connection between kingdoms and man:

> In sober truth, every "Spirit" so-called is either a disembodied or a future man. As from the highest Archangel (Dhyan Chohan) down to the last conscious "Builder" (the inferior class of spiritual entities) all such are *men,* having lived aeons ago, in our Manvantara, on this or other Spheres; so the inferior, semi-intelligent Elementals—are all *future* men.

It is taught that from the Atlantean Fourth race the Aryans inherited their most valuable sciences of the hidden virtues of precious and other stones, of chemistry, or rather alchemy, of mineralogy, geology, physics and astronomy. The Magnesian stone or Magnet was named in honor of the Magi, for they were the first to discover its wonderful properties. The priests used it for curative and magical purposes. Orpheus taught how it was possible to affect a whole audience by means of the lodestone. Paracelsus demonstrated that except in the case of the lodestone all the minerals are magnetized by the higher potencies of animal magnetism, while the lodestone enjoys it as the direct emanation from the first cause. There are occult properties in many other minerals equally strange with that in the lodestone, of which exact science is wholly ignorant. Mention is made of the Carnelian (Heb. *Odem*), worn on the breastplate of the Jewish High Priest. It is of red color and possesses a great medicinal power.

The Buddhists assert that the sapphire produces peace of mind, equanimity, and chases all evil thoughts by establishing a healthy circulation in the man. "The sapphire will open barred doors and dwell-

ings for the spirit of man; it produces a desire for prayer, and brings with it more peace than any other gem. But he who would wear it must lead a pure and holy life." The Hindus knew which was the most electric of all the prismatic colors, and the peculiar influence of the sapphire stone was as well defined as that of all other minerals. Pythagoras pays particular attention to the color and nature of precious stones; while Apollonius of Tyana imparts to his disciples the secret virtues of each, and changes his rings daily, using a particular stone for every day of the month and according to the laws of judicial astrology.

Less familiar perhaps are still other records of once cultivated relationships between man and the kingdoms, his younger brothers. Ancient writings tell of walking, prophesying, and rocking stones. Control of occult powers including vital forces makes it possible to animate statues, causing them to act and speak like living creatures. The famous stone at Westminster was called *liafail*—"the speaking stone"—which raised its voice only to name the king that had to be chosen. Pliny mentions stones which "ran away when a hand approached them." The Celts had their *clacha-brath,* the "Destiny or judgment stone"; the "divining-stone," or the "stone of the ordeal" and the oracle stone; the moving or animated stones of the Phoenicians; the rumbling stones of the Irish. . . .

Thus on and endlessly, the MONAD, the One Life, in its limitless panorama; the ever evoluting Energy, the ever changeless Essence. This Essence is the spark in the mineral, the intelligent force in plants, the instincts and qualities in the animal, and the Forty-nine Fires in man. . . . "It whirls in the breeze, blows in the hurricane, attracts and repels the waves . . . not an atom can escape it. Therefore, the ancient Sages have wisely called it the manifested God in Nature." And this is, too, the essence of MAN.

The term "astral" is used for everything beyond the physical. But, it should be understood that as on the physical we have earth, water, air and fire as divisions of this plane, so on the astral plane are similar divisions.

—ROBERT CROSBIE

YOUTH-COMPANIONS ASK— AND ANSWER

HOW can we get away from the past, in that the past determines the present and in so doing determines the future as well? It would seem to be a vicious circle. When can one best give a new impulse to a cycle?

(*a*) If the past is a conglomeration of blind forces uncaused by man and beyond his control, most certainly we are the helpless victims of a "vicious circle." And so both the determinists and the predestinarians would have it. It is evident, however, that the questioner doubts the full validity of such claims, for he adds: "When can one best give a new impulse to a cycle?"—the implication being that man *is* capable of initiating impulses. That we are affected by causes set up in the past is both natural and indisputable. But whether or not we want to "get away" from what is vaguely and mysteriously called "the past" depends on the nature of the causes now bearing fruit. Thus the question is not, "Does the past rule us?"—but, "Can we rule the past?" Though Theosophic tradition supports the premise that man is capable of molding his future, it is not to be supposed that he necessarily does. To the extent that he is moved by uncontrolled "instincts" and "basic drives," he represents the higher animal, with which orthodox psychology has been so concerned. Only to the extent that he is a conscious modifier of the thoughts which enter his brain and the actions to which habit moves him does man show a "higher intelligence."

Even though the force of well-established habits can be great, the very power of choice and will in "a new impulse" is an aspiration, and needs to become a *cycle* of aspiration. Thus the idea must first be formed and nurtured; with a clearer conception of the implications involved in a change, the auspicious occasions for emphasizing the new line of action will become apparent. In the final analysis, we are Karma. The more that we are self-conscious agents in this capacity, the less will the past hinder our future. Thus "karmaless" beings are those who are working with an unhindered, assisting past.

(*b*) The question assumes that things just happen with no conscious being as the cause of such happenings. But though our past thoughts

and acts do determine what we are going to *meet* in the present, we need not let ourselves be carried so much by the tide that the past will also *determine* the future.

If we look at Karma as what we are *making* all the time instead of what we are *receiving,* we might more readily see how this vicious circle in which we seem to be involved can be broken and a new direction given. Every moment brings opportunity for a new and better impulse to a habit or trait of some kind. Each one must at some time or other feel an urge to do things a bit better than he usually does them. This moment, for him, is the moment of new impulse. This, for him, can be a rising cycle—the promise of a "golden age" in the midst of a dark one. Of course, there are times when one may feel especially the surge of energy from all of nature, as at the New Year, but though at such times it may be easier to make a "good effort," the tide of energy will ebb unless our central source of strength is within. We must not wait, therefore, just for such times.

(*c*) Obviously, if we believe that the past determines the present and the future, then the past, for us, does determine the present and the future. However, if we propose as a corollary that it is our *interpretation* of the past that determines the present and the future, then we are granting man the power of "Free Choice," restricted only by his power to modify his environment. A behavioristic psychologist or a deterministic philosopher may point to certain stimuli in a person's environment, showing that definite, characteristic responses follow. But notice, *if* we grant man the power of free choice, these characteristic responses are nevertheless the results of choices the man himself has made, producing tendencies, as contrasted with some other possible response. The behaviorist and the determinist can only point to certain average "tendencies" in human behavior and not to determinism.

The position that man is able to interpret and modify his environment admittedly rests on the assumption that man has the power to choose. This cannot be "proved," but if man can not choose between two alternative courses of action, how is it possible for him to even take time to consider the alternative? A singularly characteristic ability of man is the "power" to hesitate.

If man cannot choose, why are his standards of morality continually changing? Perhaps changes in most societal standards of morality can be traced to definite occurrences in the history of that society. Certainly

with the individual, however, the moral standards of that individual within a single lifetime are not constant, even when the mores are.

(*d*) It is true that the past determines the present, but present *what?* The events, yes, but not our present attitude toward the ever-shifting panorama passing in view. The ever-present continually gives birth to the past. No outside power in the universe can determine a person's *choices* in the present. And as Theosophy teaches that there is *no* outside force in the universe, that all is One, then man himself is That, the One Power to shape his own destiny.

With Theosophy, a man learns to observe the workings of his own nature, and if he notices defects, the cure can be applied to the cause. Events in our own lives can teach us about the past. That is, if we apply the ideas of reincarnation and Karma. And as things happen to us in the present, we can see something of the future. Actually, the effort should be made to be continually conscious of opportunities that occur every moment, not of how well our "cycle" is progressing. While many people desire to see immediate results, a true student knows that attachment to results will only bind him. Results may indeed come in the future, perhaps lives from now, but useless it is to worry and wonder when.

Why does the statement, "The mission of the Soul is work," strike a discordant note with us, and why has play come to be at odds with work?

(a) This problem seems to be a result of our own attitudes toward our duties. Sometimes we dislike effort, yet, in many cases, our jobs may be very interesting, pleasant, and a joy to spend our time at.

It might be noted that the dictionary defines play as "opposed to work." But is this the only way we can define work? Is it not, among other things, an exertion of physical and mental powers for the accomplishment of some object—a form of progress? Possibly the difference between the two is the point that work is action with a purpose.

(b) The whole question of individuality and personality is involved in the statement. In what part of our nature does the "discord" inhere? The individuality, surely—the permanent portion of our nature—cannot look adversely upon its own mission. Perhaps we could paraphrase a statement from the *Gita* saying that what is work to the personality is play to the soul, and yet that what is play to the personality often makes work for the soul. That is, what needs to be done to fulfill the soul's

mission is easy of fulfillment for the soul, for it enjoys doing what must be done. But what the personality delights in—fulfillment of desires and passions—is difficult for the soul to endure, if the ego thus sees vital time and energy being wasted.

Failing to see the value in all associations and experiences, one begins to live only according to his likes and dislikes; he considers what he likes "play." What he dislikes to do is "work." But once a person begins to really perform actions from the mind and soul plane, he begins to see the specific potential value in any particular action. As he acts on this basis he begins to gain a joy in his work that most people might consider to accompany play.

(c) Part of "growth of soul" would seem to be a learning to like work. If work cannot be eliminated from life or made the responsibility of a particular group of people (either is proven historically impossible), then the only solution is a change of attitude.

All of nature is continually working. The lower kingdoms have a duty to perform and its continual performance makes life on this earth possible. Animals enjoy a play which is always constructive, *i.e.,* in furtherance of the purpose of life. It is said that the Masters also do not face the problem, for they find recreation in "work."

Man is the victim of his wants and needs because the awakening of self-consciousness has forced him to pick his own way through life, and though he does not see the reality in all things, yet anyone who is aware of a need to the extent that his will is moved has no great difficulty in putting aside his personal wants in favor of a larger necessity.

(d) Does the statement that "the mission of the Soul is work" strike a discordant note with everyone? Certainly there must be many to whom the statement is a challenge, a call that appeals directly to that nameless something that craves fulfillment, and which can only be satisfied by losing itself in work, the work of the Soul.

Is there something special which we set aside and label "soul work," apart from any other kind of work? We can no more separate the work of the soul from every thought or deed of ours than we can separate the Atlantic from all the drops of water that make it up. The work of the Soul would seem to be, then, the exact thing that is the reason why we are here—to learn through experience so that we may reach "conscious godhood." To those who look with distaste upon the mention of work in connection with the Soul, and who would seek to avoid such

work, we can only say to them "*stop everything;* go out of existence, for that is the only way such work is to be avoided."

Perhaps the "discordant-note" aspect of this question is due to a misunderstanding by most of us as to the meaning of work. We usually think of arduous effort, which nevertheless may be terminated periodically so that we may "rest," and play, and work again. But this is another phase of separateness, the "unforgivable" attitude.

How can one maintain a willing attitude towards others and at the same time avoid having people take advantage of him?

Each has his duties in life which to him are challenges and sacred lessons for the soul. Such become known to a man when he begins to see the Path and his own position in the procession upon that Path. The messengers, however, while leading each to study his own inner self, still left no doubt but that the fuel for the inner altar is to be gathered by each one for himself.

A willingness to help others, an unsuspecting, trusting attitude, can certainly at times be turned by others toward their own personal selfish ends. In this day and age, such a reaction is not unexpected. But what after all is the calamity in having others "take advantage" of our friendliness? Compare the Karma of one who only offers friendliness, and one who is offered friendship but abuses the offer.

Of course, many people mistake an easy-going, friendly attitude as a weakness, and if a firm but polite stand is never taken on a matter of principle, they may be encouraged to continue along this mistaken vein. Sometimes students of Theosophy feel that they must go through life without antagonizing people. But it must be that, inasmuch as some events in our lives are important steps in the soul's evolution, friction and difficulty will for a time ensue.

Does a friendly attitude necessarily imply being a person with no backbone? One can show others that he is perfectly willing to be helpful, but that he is not to be taken advantage of.

Most of us, it would seem, are too concerned with the "moral evolution" of others. We must try to remember that Karma is a good adjuster. Just as when we do something wrong we can be sure to feel the consequences, so it is with another. If he is trying to avoid responsibilities we can be sure Karma will soon place him in a situation where he cannot escape the assumption of his own responsibility.

THOUGHTS ON EVERYDAY OCCURRENCES

The States of Matter

The three "states," so-called of our terrestrial matter, known as the "solid," "liquid," and "gaseous," are only, in strict accuracy, SUB-states. (*S.D.* II, 737)

OUR everyday experiences bring to our attention facets of Occultism so commonplace that they are likely to be overlooked. "Familiarity breeds contempt," later, indifference. Within the human body alone the most intricate processes defying physical interpretation continuously occur. At one stage of human development, these processes were doubtless a matter of conscious effort, and man was fully aware of the means and method of each bodily function. In time the automatic action of the functions—such as breathing, digestion, heartbeat, and sense-perception—led to less attention on the part of the human mind on the mechanism and more on the *purpose* of the function. Yet in the course of *forgetfulness* of purpose, which is characteristic of Kali Yuga, we have also forgotten our own relation to the physics, chemistry, and physiology of the bodily actions.

The basic principles of the sciences underlying "organic" life are the same principles which govern the "inorganic," and while modern science has "rediscovered" many of these principles, it usually gives them a limited interpretation.

> Science is honeycombed with metaphysical conceptions, but the Scientists will not admit the charge and fight desperately to put atomo-mechanical masks on purely incorporeal and spiritual laws in nature. . . . (*S.D.* I, 544.)
>
> . . . there is no inorganic or *dead* matter in nature, the distinction between the two made by Science being unfounded as it is arbitrary and devoid of reason. (*S.D.* I, 280.)

Since H.P.B.'s day, much of the materialistic mask has fallen from worldly science. Yet it has not completely fallen, and her criticisms of science remain generally true. While molecules and atoms are no longer regarded as the "solid" building blocks of life, the invisible side of nature is perceived by few. Even the mind and psychic nature are generally regarded as products of matter rather than as higher, independent entities. Yet it is useful to examine some of the basic con-

cepts and phenomena of physics, chemistry, and physiology in the light of Theosophy. The observations which follow here are speculative in part, but may have worth to the student as points of departure—as, for instance, in considering the so-called "states of matter."

From everyday experience we are familiar with matter in the states of solid, liquid, and gas. We "feel" the effect of water vapor in the air on hot days when the humidity is high. Yet the effect is not a visible one although very physical and real. Too much moisture in the air reacts on physiological processes, which in turn cause a visible effect and reaction.

In addition to the three definite states of matter, which apply to all substances, there are critical states between the familiar ones. The state of a substance depends on its composition, temperature, pressure, and other factors. In order to change states, however, a transfer of energy must take place. Water at 32°F and normal pressure requires removal of a definite amount of energy for each unit of mass to be frozen before it can become ice at 32°F. Likewise, in vaporizing, water requires addition of a definite amount of energy for each unit of mass evaporated; then water at 212°F becomes steam at 212°F. The amount of energy removed or added is of academic interest at this point; it can be found in any physics or chemistry text. Yet it is a fact that it takes energy to get a substance through the critical states.

Complex substances, such as metallic alloys, change state in a somewhat different manner. Instead of changing at a single temperature, the change occurs over a range of temperatures. The manner of their passing through the critical state helps to determine the properties of metals, alloys, and other substances. The manner of crystal formation is a factor affecting properties, and this depends very much on the critical state.

Air is known generally as a gas. It can be liquefied and solidified at low temperatures. But since air is a mixture of gases rather than a compound or alloy, the critical states of its components occur independently. Thus oxygen may be separated from air by boiling off nitrogen from liquid air while it remains unaffected in state, and may be later collected at its special temperature of boiling. In the case of an alloy, the components take on new properties different from the properties of either constituent; they cannot act independently, and their very interdependence gives them new characteristics and uses.

In these simple facts about material states, what occult hints may the Theosophist recognize? For one thing, the secrets of creation are symbolized in the change of states. It takes energy release or absorption to produce a change of state. So, in the process of creation, energy is transferred from one plane to another. The evolution of form on lower planes cannot proceed without the infusion of energy from above. Mental energy, spiritual energy, and other forms of "directional" or purposive force are realities of a more substantial nature than is physical energy. In writing of cosmic processes, H.P.B. says:

> . . . when the so-called "Creation," or formation of a planet, is accomplished by that force which is designated by the Occultists LIFE and by Science "energy," then the process takes place from within outwardly, every atom being said to contain in itself creative energy of the divine breath. (*S.D.* I, 11 fn.)
>
> The life-principle, or *life energy,* which is omnipresent, eternal, indestructible, is a *force* and a PRINCIPLE as *noumenon,* atoms, as *phenomenon.* It is one and the same thing, and cannot be considered as separate except in materialism.
>
> Force . . . is *the transformation into energy of the supra-conscious thought of the Logos. . . .*

We daily witness the use of higher forms of energy in man's mastery over the elements of nature, in his vast organized projects undertaken to fill his physical needs, and in ideological struggles. Mental energy mobilizes physical energy, uses it as a tool. We can imagine, then, the vast scope of the subtle energies above the mental, which for the sake of simplicity we may call "spiritual"—a word in disrepute among men of science but one worthy of being redefined and used.

The vast realm of psychic energies, forces, and phenomena lies on either side of the mental realm. It would require a lengthy treatise just to describe these forces—supposing it could be done with exactitude. For the present, only a few suggestions may be offered. The psychic, though highly developed in man, is present in the lower kingdoms as "feeling." Psychic energy doubtless controls the states of matter in a far wider manner than suspected. While mental energy gives direction and purpose, psychic energy may be thought of as the connecting link between purposive direction and its fulfillment. It would therefore control details of physical processes and give form and color to thoughts.

Turning to the human body, we find matter in all three states, or rather "sub-states," in the words of H.P.B. In order to know the real

states, we would need familiarity with the invisible side of nature. Hence, any discussion on a physical level will be limited, serving chiefly through analogy. The solid state of the body is largely an illusion. The body is composed largely of liquids. Part of it is gaseous, as for instance air dissolved in the blood stream. The relationship of material in all three states is of interest. Air, for instance, is needed for metabolism, for the provision of energy for vital life processes. Air enters the lungs, reaches the remotest regions of the body through the medium of the blood, a liquid. It then helps to burn up "solid" matter.

The body burns substance for energy to move and live. The source of energy is in the food we eat. When the assimilated food has served its useful purpose, waste-products result which must be disposed of. The blood stream removes a large part of the wastes, bringing it to various regions of the body for disposal. All wastes eventually go back to the plant kingdom, are made into plant substance, and reach the higher kingdoms, again, either remotely or directly. Thus the truth, on even the physical plane, of the saying, "My own shall come back to me."

What happens when food is assimilated, stored, built into body tissue, and finally sent out as waste matter? Here, in small, the whole process of evolution is manifest. Lesser intelligences contribute to the life of greater intelligences and are thereby raised. Simple substances are built into complex organic forms in the human body. There, for a time, as part of the intelligent functioning of some human organ or tissue, the former mineral and plant or animal lives contact the dynamic energy of thought and purpose. For a time they work in and with human intelligence, are duly impressed by it, then depart and make the round of the lower kingdoms again.

> Matter is the vehicle for the manifestation of soul on this plane of existence, and soul is the vehicle on a higher plane for the manifestation of spirit, and these three are a trinity synthesized by Life, which pervades them all. The idea of universal life is one of those ancient conceptions which are returning to the human mind in this century . . . The idea of "crystalline life," now familiar to science, would have been scouted half a century ago . . . It hardly seems possible that science can disguise from itself much longer, by the mere use of terms such as "force" and "energy," the fact that things that have life are living things, whether they be atoms or planets. (*S.D.* I, 49.)

Gaseous, liquid, and solid lives of all kingdoms constantly move through all kingdoms, share, and learn. The human body is composed of all the lives and kingdoms on earth. For a fleeting moment, the "lower" becomes a vehicle for the "higher" to see through. Yet the human body is not Man. The body without the Thinker is an entity without a purpose. The Thinker directs the motion of the lives, organizes them, galvanizes them into a unified whole, and sends them back through the kingdoms with new impressions.

From another point of view, the body may represent the solid state, the inner or astral body the liquid state, and the mind the gaseous state. The illusory solidity of the body is like the crystal of the mineral kingdom, the densest form and perfect symbol of the solid state. The astral body is plastic, extensible, and fluid in nature. Mind travels like the wind, changes rapidly, is easily "compressed and expanded" like a gas, and exhibits independence in its reactions (like the gases in air previously noted). The energy which directs the mind might be likened to the element of Fire, more ethereal than even a gas.

To close, we might note some statements in *The Secret Doctrine* on states of matter in the history of the earth. In the First Round (the earliest period in the earth's history), the globe was built by "the primitive fire-lives . . . had no solidity, nor qualifications. . . ." Toward the end of this Round, the Earth "developed one Element which from its inorganic, so to say, or simple Essence became now in our Round the fire we know throughout the system." (I, 259.) In the next stage, the Second Round, the gaseous element (symbolized by air) came into its own. The Third developed the fluid, or liquid state. The Fourth "transformed the gaseous fluids and plastic form of our globe into the hard, crusted, grossly material sphere we are now living on." (I, 260.) Since the Fourth Round represents the densest state reached, future Rounds will repeat the material states of the early Rounds. The evolution of soul, however, although guided by the states of matter, is a continuous process throughout.

ON THE LOOKOUT

Mysticism In Mid-Ocean

A *Saturday Evening Post* series by Col. Charles A. Lindbergh, recounting the events of his original trans-Atlantic flight, brings to light a remarkable experience during the most trying hours of his adventure. (The series began in April and continued through ten installments.) Extreme fatigue was Lindbergh's chief handicap, since he had had no sleep for twenty-three hours before the flight, and he tells how, in his need for sufficient strength to keep alert, a "third element" in his consciousness appeared to take over his failing physical faculties; he came, he writes, to rely on this "other self" with complete trust. The following is his own account:

> As minutes pass I fall into the state of eye-open sleep again. I fly with less anguish when my conscious mind is not awake. There's a part of me—a third element ruling body and mind—which is directing my flight, knowing when the alarm must be given to my ordinary senses. At first my conscious mind didn't trust its new acquaintance. But now, when sleep presses close and hard, my mind gives over command entirely, as an ailing man gives over a business he once thought no one else could run. . . . When I fall asleep this way, my eyes are cut off from my ordinary mind; they become connected to this new, extraordinary mind which grows increasingly competent.

Internal Resources

Admiral Richard Byrd, during his trials of hardship, alone and ill in Antarctica for several months, found a similar "third element" of consciousness to see him through. Byrd later remarked that "few men during their lifetime come anywhere near exhausting the resources dwelling within them. There are deep wells of strength that are never used."

The Theosophist finds an explanation for such experiences in the teaching that man is more than body and mind, as we know them; he is an immortal soul with vast powers which may be availed of under the right conditions. Lindbergh's experience appears to transcend the merely psychic and gives evidence of being "egoic." In all times there have been tales of "untapped resources" coming to the aid of the personal man in dire need—especially to men of courage and will, for these two characteristics of the soul appear able to burst the bonds of

the physical body and senses, enabling the real man within to express its powers freely.

Another Dimension of Consciousness

Lindbergh, at the time of his historic flight, appears to have been responsive to mysticism in a theosophic sense. He says, "I've never believed in apparitions, but how can I explain the forms I carried with me through so many hours of this day? Transparent forms in human outline—voices that spoke with authority and clearness—that told me—that told me—but what did they tell me? I can't remember a single word they said." Whatever happened, he made no attempt to interpret it specifically, seeming to realize that such experiences have no adequate explanation in familiar terms. But it is apparent that Col. Lindbergh came to realize that other dimensions of consciousness are possible. He recalls his impressions:

The "Astral Light?"

> While I'm staring at the instruments during an unearthly age of time, conscious and asleep, the fuselage behind me becomes filled with ghostly presences—vague, transparent forms riding weightless with me in the plane. Without turning my head, I see them clearly. My skull is one great eye.
>
> These phantoms speak with friendly, human voices. One and then another presses forward to my shoulder, and then draws back among the group. At times, voices come out of the air itself, advising on my flight, discussing problems of my navigation, reassuring me, giving me messages of importance unattainable in ordinary life.
>
> There's no longer weight to my body. The feeling of flesh is gone. I'm still attached to life, but at any moment some thin band may snap. Then there will be no difference between me and my vaporlike passengers. I'm on the border line of life and a greater realm beyond. Is this death? Death no longer seems the final end, but rather the entering of a new and free existence.
>
> Will I fly my airplane on to Europe and live in flesh as I have before, feeling hunger, pain and cold, or am I about to join these ghostly forms? The spirits have no rigid bodies, yet they remain human in outline form. They're neither intruders nor strangers. It's more like a gathering of friends, as though I've known all of them in some past incarnation.
>
> I live in the past, the present and the future all at once. Around me are old associations, bygone friendships, voices from ancestrally distant times. I'm flying in a plane over the Atlantic Ocean, but I'm also living in years now far away.

On After-Death States

Although "liberal-minded" scholars among the Catholics may, when talking with other intellectuals, give the idea that the old dead-letter interpretations of doctrine are no longer required, there are grounds for concluding that the Church gives no more quarter than it must. Heaven, Hell, and Purgatory are still in business as usual, as is evident from the following advertisement authorized by the Supreme Council of the Knights of Columbus. It proclaims:

> Man's life in this world, the Church tells us, is a preparation for the world to come . . . a testing-time which ends with our death. What happens after that depends on whether death finds us loyal to God, or opposed to Him and the way He expects us to live.

No Second Chance

> Death does not bring merely a long, unconscious slumber, but rather a quick awakening to the irrevocable judgment of our Creator. Nor does it bring us a second chance to prove ourselves or to amend our erring ways. In our own hands rests the opportunity . . . and upon our own heads the responsibility . . to determine if death shall be the threshold to everlasting life among the blessed, or among the lost.
>
> Some scoff at the suggestion that an everlasting hell could be permitted by a merciful God. Others seem to think that God will treat them kindly if they live reasonably moral lives, even though they pay Him no special honor which is His due.

A Theosophical Commentary

How different the dogmas of Eternal Salvation and Eternal Damnation are from the doctrine of moral self-determination as presented in Theosophy! The following passages from the pamphlet, *What Is Death?,* highlight the contrast:

> The oldest and most complete theories on "after-death states" are those once held in India, in the days of a wise and great civilization. The general ideas which these old beliefs represent . . . are extensions of what man can learn about his own mental states during life. The old Hindu ideas of "Devachan" meant a state in which for a time between births each man exists in god-like fashion within his surviving mind. On the other hand, "Kama-loka" represents a condition of confusion just following the death of the body, when the soul is separating itself from all the irrational passions and desires active during the life last lived. This period of Kama-loka, like the happier sort of

dream-state which follows, was held to be long or short *entirely according to the nature of a person's thoughts and emotions during life.*

The notions about heaven and hell, with which the people of "Christian" nations are more or less familiar, are probably the crude remains of earlier and more philosophical ideas.

Modern Trends in Biological Chemistry

H. P. Blavatsky, in her *Secret Doctrine* (1888), said: "There is but one science that can henceforth direct modern research into the one path which will lead to the discovery of the whole, hitherto occult, truth, and it is the youngest of all—*chemistry,* as it now stands reformed." Results of recent experiments in biochemistry give promise of substantiating this statement.

An Example

AP Science Reporter Rennie Taylor (in the Hollywood *Citizen-News* for May 19) writes:

An experiment indicating that the cells which make up the bodies of humans and animals may be colonies of invisible virus-like organisms was reported today to the American Tuberculosis Assn. in sessions at the Biltmore and Statler Hotels.

This startling theory, which if established would upset the long-accepted belief that the cell is the smallest unit of animal life, was presented by Dr. Oscar Kanner, pathologist of the Veterans Administration Hospital at Oteen, N.C.

For more than 100 years the cell has been considered the basic, indivisible particle of living matter. Dr. Kanner's findings open the way for speculation that a single cell can be divided into millions or even billions of parts which can live and multiply.

A New Theory?

This theory—although it may be new and startling to Dr. Kanner, his colleagues, and many others—is *not* new to theosophists, who have long been accustomed to the idea that "Each particle—whether you call it organic or inorganic—*is a life.*" (*S.D.* I, 261.) Nor is it clear *why* Dr. Kanner should have implied, and the Science Reporter explicitly stated, that the cell is still considered to be "the basic, indivisible particle of living matter."

Although the cell is the *unit of structure and function* of which animals and plants are composed, it has been known for years to some

biological chemists that life is found in the colloids. Alfred Korzybski, in *Science and Sanity,* first published in 1933, says: "As all life is found in the colloidal form and has many characteristics found also in inorganic colloids, it appears that colloids supply us with the most important link between the inorganic and the organic. This fact also suggests entirely new fields for the study of the living cells. . . ."

Life in the Colloidal Form

In 1936, Dr. Geo. W. Crile published his *Phenomena of Life,* in which he told of "growing" a cell—by first breaking down the cell structure into colloidal form, then splitting the poles of the colloids, and finally putting together a positive and a negative pole. From this union, a new cell developed.

Thus the *startling* aspect of the implications of Dr. Kanner's experiment seems somewhat over-emphasized by Mr. Taylor—unless his reaction be taken as an example of delayed impact on lay minds of facts long recognized by biological chemists. And Dr. Kanner's experiment seems to have been an investigation along lines suggested by former experiments with the colloids, rather than a departure in an entirely new direction. Again, to quote from the article in the *Citizen-News:*

> Using finely ground parts of guinea pig organs that were free of tuberculosis, Dr. Kanner made a solution which he injected into other healthy guinea pigs and caused not only disease but death.
>
> The length of time it took the disease to develop was evidence that the injected substance contained living organisms. Animals did not get sick until three to six months after the injection. If the substance had been a toxin or poison which sometimes is extracted from cells the disease would have developed quickly . . .

Exact Science Confirms

Experiments such as this show a trend in biochemistry, offering empirical confirmation of many statements made in *The Secret Doctrine* —such as that on page 262, Vol. I:

> We are taught that every physiological change, in addition to pathological phenomena; diseases—nay, life itself—or rather the objective phenomena of life, produced by certain conditions and changes in the tissues of the body which allow and force life to act in that body; that all this is due to those unseen CREATORS and DESTROYERS that are called in such a loose and general way, microbes.

When Is Disease Not Disease?

Mr. Taylor's article continues:

> Tests further show that the invisible particles are not disease organisms so long as they remain in the cells of the animal which produced them. It is only when they are transferred to another environment in another animal that they become dangerous.
>
> A parallel in human disease also has been found, Dr. Kanner said. This is called serum hepatitis, a liver disorder attributed to injections of blood serum from healthy people to other healthy ones as a vaccine against yellow fever. In the blood stream of the donors this serum particle caused no disease. But in the body of the vaccinated person it produced illness, sometimes serious.

Occult Science Explains

Although modern science now recognizes that "by structural necessity, every expression of cellular activity involves some sort of colloidal behaviour; and any factor disturbing the colloidal structure must be disturbing to the welfare of the organism" (Korzybski), it is left to Occult Science to explain the basic interdependence and interaction of "the lives."

> The "fiery lives" are the seventh and highest subdivision of the plane of matter, and correspond in the individual with the One Life of the Universe, though only on that plane. The microbes of science are the first and lowest sub-division on the second plane—that of material *prana* (or life). The physical body of man undergoes a complete change of structure every seven years, and its destruction and preservation are due to the alternate function of the fiery lives as "destroyers" and "builders." They are "builders" by sacrificing themselves in the form of vitality to restrain the destructive influence of the microbes, and, by supplying the microbes with what is necessary, they compel them under that restraint to build up the material body and its cells. They are "destroyers" also when that restraint is removed and the microbes, unsupplied with vital constructive energy, are left to run riot as destructive *agents*. (*S.D.* I, 262-3 fn.)

Interference with Nature's Balance

In the New York *Herald-Tribune* (Nov. 17, 1952), Dr. Walter C. Alvarez reported the conclusions of three groups of investigators who had been collecting data in order to verify (or nullify) the "impression that tonsillectomy increased the susceptibility to polio." Dr. Alvarez states:

> Among 3,601 cases in Los Angeles County, although there was no evidence that an old tonsillectomy rendered children more subject to polio, the figures showed that a recent tonsillectomy, performed less than 30 days before, made the child, if he got any polio at all, twice as likely to get the severe "bulbar" type of the disease—that awful type of the disease which hits the brain hard and often kills the child in a few days . . .
>
> This means that hereafter the wise parent will, if possible, avoid having his children's tonsils removed during a summer epidemic of polio. Fortunately, there seldom is any emergency about the operation, and hence it can usually be postponed until October or later.

Evidently, even when *diseased* tissue is removed from the organism, an appreciable time-lapse must occur before the "balance of forces" is restored. If an infectious "microbe" is introduced before this balance is attained, the results are likely to be dire. Also, one may wonder if all the organs, even tonsils and appendix, may not be constantly supplying invisible "balancing" elements.

The Eventual Result

Thus, as one scientific discovery follows another, each penetrating ever more deeply into the hitherto "unknown" realm of the life-processes, scientists may be forced from materialistic fortresses once thought impregnable. H.P.B. once wrote:

> They will be driven out of their position not by spiritual, theosophical, or any other physical or even mental phenomena, but simply by the enormous *gaps* and *chasms* that open daily and will still be opening before them, as one discovery follows the other, until they are finally knocked off their feet by the ninth wave of simple common sense. (*S.D.* I, 620.)

Further "Invasions"

The study of biochemistry in relation to disease and imbalances of the body points to other inimical factors involved in conventional medical practice. Unfortunate results accompanying greatly increased invasions of the blood stream by serums are being chronicled in medical magazines more and more frequently, but the health of the nation appears to be threatened from another quarter also, with an invasion of *disease breeding* elements through the very food we eat and the medicines we take as cures for our illnesses.

Physical Culture (May, 1953) presents a review article by Dr. John Arthur, pathologist-penologist, summarizing from a theory which has

been gaining popularity among researchers—detailed in Dr. Boris Sokoloff's book *Cancer, New Approaches, New Hope* (Devin-Adair, New York, 1952). In view of the often expressed opinion that "no one knows" what causes cancer, as Dr. Arthur explains, such a book "is very important because it reveals the names of eminent doctors and biochemists who have found *many* causes for cancer."

The Evidence Accumulates

Dr. Sokoloff presents the theory as follows:

> The opinion has been expressed that the strenuous way of modern living brings about hormonal disturbances, an underlying factor in some cancerous growth. But a more popular theory, which seems to be gaining considerable ground among cancerologists, is that modern industrialization, with its inorganic fertilizers, utilization of various chemical by-products, and the abuse of drugs and patent medicines, should be blamed for it (Cancer). It has been said that sulfa drugs, used so widely during the last decades, are not so innocuous as far as cancer is concerned as was assumed before. It was reported that some antibiotics seem to stimulate tumor growth and might participate in the formation of it. On the other hand, the continual introduction into the human organism of some inorganic substances which are components of numerous drugs and laxatives, might in the end disturb the delicate biochemical balance of the human body and create favorable conditions for the formation of malignant growths. As early as 1918 it was established that certain chemicals could cause cancer.

Cancer On The Increase

Cancer and its cause are major health concerns in both England and America. In England the cancer death rate doubled in 1952. In the United States, in 1952, the rate of lung cancer in men doubled. The results of researches along the lines suggested by Dr. Sokoloff provide evidence not easily dismissed that we are using some of the tools of industry to destroy ourselves. Dr. Arthur presents the following claims:

> Through vitamins, antibiotics, food and medicine, you may be the direct cause for producing cancer in your children's bodies—including your own. If you smoke cigarettes, you may die from cancer of the throat or lungs 10 or 15 years after you have started the smoking habit. You have a double-risk on smoking. Tobacco is treated with arsenic while growing. It is grown in nitrate and other chemically treated soils. Nicotine, which is a by-product of tobacco, can cause cancer. You can get cancer faster from smoking than from eating the vegetables grown in nitrate treated soils. Take medicine, smoke cigarettes,

drink soda-pop, put lots of butter on your bread, drink all kinds of medicine for your colds and eat vegetables grown in chemical fertilizers, and you will come out with a body seething with cancer. Why? Because butter-fat (yellow butter dye) causes cancer. Soda-pop coloring (vegetable dyes) causes cancer. Nitrates used for fertilizer, cause cancer. Nicotine causes cancer. Antibiotic drugs and many other medicinal remedies cause cancer.

PSYCHO-SOMATIC ASPECT OF DISEASE

Although Dr. Sokoloff's book is chiefly concerned with the trends among cancerologists, in the latter portion of his book he presents a "psycho-somatic" view which will be of interest to Theosophists:

> The personality of the patient is dismissed lightly; it is a non-existent factor in cancer treatment. This actually was and still is the strongest negative side in cancer treatment today. For in cancer, more than any other diseases, the individualistic characteristics of the affected person should be taken into consideration. His morale, his mental state, his diet, his temperament, his habits and inclinations all may have a bearing on the course of his illness.

NEW EMPHASIS IN MEDICAL EDUCATION

The New York *Times* for Dec. 7, 1952, printed a summary of studies made in the field of medical education, by Howard A. Rusk, M.D.—the result of inquiries undertaken to find a satisfactory answer to questions such as: "How do I go about selecting a physician? How can I be sure he is competent? Where can I find a good general practitioner?"

Since the Council on Medical Education of the American Medical Association long ago felt that the key to the answers to these questions lay in the medical schools, the A.M.A. instituted a series of studies, the first of which was the Flexner Study of 1910, undertaken by the Carnegie Foundation, and the last being in 1952, sponsored by the Commonwealth Fund. Dr. Rusk reports that "three phases in adjustment" in medical education are high-lighted by these investigations.

The Flexner Report of 1910 dealt with a situation then universal and still prevailing. It found that at that time "medical education had scientific medicine as its objective and slogan, specialization as its dominant pattern, and the university medical center as its preferred instrument." It found, also, that although medical graduates were adequately trained, they were not educated in any *general* sense—due largely to the lax entrance requirements of many medical schools.

It was characterictic that Lawrence J. Henderson, the Harvard biological chemist, remarked at about this time that the progress of medicine in America had reached a point where it became possible to say that "a random patient with a random disease consulting a physician at random stood better than a 50-50 chance of benefiting from the encounter"—randomly speaking.

Progressive Enlightenment

As a result of the Flexner Report, medical leaders began to look searchingly at the field of medical education. We quote:

> The objectives of this self-scrutiny are rather well summed up in the 1952 report of the Commonwealth Fund. They are, the report states . . . to shift emphasis from teaching to learning, from the department to the school, and from the specialty to the patient . . .
>
> These trends are by no means universal and even schools which earnestly wish to move in these directions find it hard and sometimes painful to do so, for while the medical school may have superb potentialities as an instrument of change, it is itself an institution with a rigid structure and powerful vested interests.

During this second phase in medical education, scientific medicine was primarily physiological. In recent years, however, "psychology, anthropology, sociology and the other behavioural sciences have made long strides" and there has been some reaction against the extremes of specialization, particularly from the public, which complains about the scarcity of competent general practitioners.

The article continues:

> . . . It is reasonable to hope that this second, or transitional, phase will be followed by a third phase in which there will be some reconciliation between what has been called scientific medicine and what is now called comprehensive medicine . . .
>
> The Commonwealth Fund is not alone in its views on medical education. There are many who fear that, in our medical education today, we are losing the tradition of the "great physician" to that of the "distinguished scientist," a title which in itself, they assert, connotes a certain detachment from patients as human beings.

This new orientation in medical education will indeed be soul-satisfying to the patient who, trudging from one specialist to another and *another,* begins to feel that he is merely a conglomeration of unrelated parts which have lost contact with the whole.

THE FREEDOM TO READ

The American Library Association, meeting in Los Angeles the last week of June, adopted a "manifesto and resolution" which the Editors of the *Nation* published in lieu of their own editorial in the July 4 issue. They consider it "the most effective defense yet published of what might be called the Sixth Freedom—the Freedom to Read." We quote some passages:

> The freedom to read is essential to our democracy. It is under attack. Private groups and public authorities in various parts of the country are working to remove books from sale, to censor textbooks, to label "controversial" books, to distribute lists of "objectionable" books or authors, and to purge libraries.

THE DANGERS OF ORTHODOXY

> We are aware, of course, that books are not alone in being subjected to efforts at suppression. We are aware that these efforts are related to a larger pattern of pressures being brought against education, the press, films, radio, and television. The problem is not only one of actual censorship. The shadow of fear cast by these pressures leads, we suspect, to an even larger voluntary curtailment of expression by those who seek to avoid controversy.
>
> Yet suppression is never more dangerous than in such a time of social tension. Freedom has given the United States the elasticity to endure strain. Freedom keeps open the path of novel and creative solutions, and enables change to come by choice. Every silencing of a heresy, every enforcement of an orthodoxy, diminishes the toughness and resilience of our society and leaves it the less able to deal with stress.
>
> We believe that free communication is essential to the preservation of a free society and a creative culture. We believe that these pressures toward conformity present the danger of limiting the range and variety of inquiry and expression on which our democracy and our culture depend.
>
> The freedom to read is guaranteed by the Constitution. Those with faith in free men will stand firm on these constitutional rights and will exercise the responsibilities that accompany these rights.

A "FUNDAMENTAL PREMISE"

The Library Association feels that the reader does not need a censor to protect him from ideas; that the average man can detect "propaganda" and "obscenity"; in short, it proposes that the reader should be allowed to make his own choice.

ULT LIBRARY
BANGALORE.
Accn. No. 1627